

September 20, 2004

Honorable Board of Supervisors  
County of Los Angeles  
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, California 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**LOCAL COASTAL PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. 02-247-(4)  
COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT CASE NO. 02-247-(4)  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 02-247-(4)  
PETITIONER: THE SANTA CATALINA ISLAND COMPANY  
P.O. BOX 737  
AVALON, CA 90704  
SANTA CATALINA ISLAND ZONED DISTRICT NO. 127  
FOURTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT (3-VOTE)**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:**

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for Local Coastal Plan Amendment No. 02-247-(4), Coastal Development Permit No. 02-247-(4) and Conditional Use Permit No. 02-247-(4), together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.
2. Instruct County Counsel, to prepare the ordinance map reflecting the change of land use policy within the Two Harbors Resort Village District of the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Plan as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission (Local Coastal Plan Amendment No. 02-247-(4)).
3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare the necessary findings to affirm the Regional Planning Commission's approval of Coastal Development Permit & Conditional Use Permit No. 02-247-(4).

**PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

- Update the land use designation on the subject property to allow the property owner to develop the property with a use that is compatible with the existing surrounding uses and necessary for the benefit of the public.
- Establish development standards that ensure future development on the subject property will be compatible with the goals and policies of the Local Coastal Program.

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 2 of 62**

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit promote the County's Strategic Plan goal of Service Excellence. The project components (Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit) were carefully researched and analyzed to ensure that quality information regarding the subject property is available.

This Local Coastal Plan Amendment and conditional use permit also promotes the County's vision for improving the quality of life in Los Angeles County. The approval of this Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit will allow the development of an above-ground fuel storage facility to be used by residents and visitors to Two Harbors to fuel both land and water vehicles.

**FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING**

Implementation of the proposed Local Coastal Plan Amendment should not result in any new significant costs to the County or to the Department of Regional Planning; no request for financing is being made.

**FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS**

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a concurrent public hearing on Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4) on May 19, 2004. The three zoning requests before the Commission were: 1) a Local Coastal Plan Amendment from the existing Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District of the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Plan to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict on 0.8 acres, 2) a Coastal Development Permit to authorize demolition and construction in the coastal zone, and 3) a Conditional Use Permit to authorize the establishment of an above-ground fuel storage facility in the proposed Utilities/Services Subdistrict. The Regional Planning Commission indicated their intent to recommend approval of the requested Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit at their May 19, 2004 meeting and took final action on this recommendation at their July 14, 2004 meeting.

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Sections 65335 and 65856 of the Government Code. Notice of the hearing must be given pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Government Code Sections 6061, 65090, 65355 and 65856 relating to notice of public hearing.

**ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

The proposed Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit will not have a significant effect on the environment. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project.

Based on the Negative Declaration, adoption of the proposed plan Local Coastal Plan Amendment will not have a significant effect on the environment.

**IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES OR (OR PROJECTS)**

Action on the Local Coastal Plan Amendment is not anticipated to have a negative impact on current services.

Respectfully Submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING  
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Frank Meneses, Administrator  
Current Planning Division

FM:RJF:KJ

Attachments: Commission Resolution, Final Letter, Findings & Conditions, Staff Report & Attachments

C: Chief Administrative Officer  
County Counsel  
Assessor  
Director, Department of Public Works

**A RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
RELATING TO  
LOCAL COASTAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 02-247-(4)**

**WHEREAS**, Article 6 of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (commencing with Section 65350) provides for the adoption of amendments to county general plans; and

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has conducted a concurrent public hearing in the matter of Local Coastal Plan Case No. 02-247-(4), Coastal Development Permit Case No. 02-247-(4) and Conditional Use Permit 02-247-(4) on May 19, 2004; and,

**WHEREAS**, in compliance with the California Coastal Act of 1976, as amended to date, the County of Los Angeles has prepared an amendment to the certified Local Coastal Program for Santa Catalina Island; and

**WHEREAS**, the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program consists of a Land Use Plan and Local Implementation Program, which includes a Specific Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, an amendment to the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program element of the Los Angeles County General Plan is necessary at this time to address unique circumstances in the unincorporated territory of Santa Catalina Island; and

**WHEREAS**, the amendment to the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program includes modifications to the Land Use Plan and Local Implementation Program and related text, for the unincorporated area of Santa Catalina Island commonly known as Two Harbors; and

**WHEREAS**, a Negative Declaration for the project has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State and County guidelines relating thereto; and

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Commission has considered the public testimony, the recommendations and testimony of the Regional Planning Department staff, and the Negative Declaration, including the documentation within each file; and

**WHEREAS**, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The applicant is requesting a change of the land use designation of the subject property from the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District to the

Utilities/Services Subdistrict on a 3,600 square foot piece of property. As the property is located in the Coastal Zone, the Coastal Development Permit requirement will assure that development occurring after reclassification of the property will conform to the approved plans and will ensure compatibility with the surrounding area. As applied in this case, the Coastal Development Permit will restrict the development of the re-classified site to an above-ground fuel storage facility. No other development is permitted on the property unless a new Coastal Development Permit is obtained.

2. The subject property consists of a 3,600-square foot portion of Two Harbors (Lot 88), approximately 400 feet south of the Isthmus Cove shoreline, Santa Catalina Island, and in the Santa Catalina Island Zoned District.
3. Access to the property is taken via an unnamed dirt road to the southeast.
4. Surrounding land use designations in the vicinity of the subject site include Residential to the north, west and south and Marine Commercial to the east.
5. The subject site is currently used for outdoor storage of heavy equipment and vehicles, a legal nonconforming use.
6. Surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the subject site include residential uses to the north; vehicle storage, a workshop, and boat & vehicle parking to the south; an office, a storage tank, parking, and a boat yard to the east; and vacant land and single family residences to the west.
7. The Local Coastal Plan Amendment request was heard concurrently with Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4), a related request to authorize the establishment of an above-ground fuel storage facility on the subject property, at a May 19, 2004 public hearing.
8. The applicant's site plan, marked Exhibit "A", depicts the location of the proposed 1,296 square foot building that will house the two 28' x 11.5' fuel storage tanks and two dispensers that will be located at the eastern end of the building on a concrete pad and protected by two metal bollards per dispenser. The elevation drawings depict the maximum height of the proposed building at approximately 16 feet, 3 inches. A 10 square foot sign is depicted on the building face, the bottom of which is at 6 feet, 5 inches above grade.
9. The United States Environmental Protection Agency has required the removal of the existing underground fuel storage tanks that service land and water-based vehicles at

Two Harbors, including emergency vehicles. The proposed above-ground facility will replace the existing underground tanks and will be used for the same.

10. The subject property is located in the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District. The proposed above-ground fuel facility is inconsistent with the current land use designation of the subject property. A need exists for the proposed Local Coastal Plan Amendment from the Residential Subdistrict to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict to allow the owner to establish an above-ground fuel facility on the subject property.
11. A Local Coastal Program Amendment is required for the proposed fuel storage facility due to the fact that there is no appropriate land use designation that would allow such use within 900 feet of the Isthmus Cove pier, the maximum distance that the fuel tanks can be located from a fuel dispenser.
12. The proposed facility is consistent with existing land uses to the south and is a natural progression from the Marine Commercial Subdistrict to the Residential Subdistrict.
13. The subject property is a proper location for the proposed Utilities/Services Subdistrict classification and placement of the proposed district at such location will be in the interest of public health, safety and general welfare, and in conformity with good zoning practice because the proposed facility is consistent with existing land uses to the south and is a natural progression from the Marine Commercial Subdistrict to the Residential Subdistrict. The use will serve the local area and the new location will remove conflicts and congestion from the existing fueling location at the Isthmus Cove shoreline.
14. The proposed Local Coastal Plan Amendment from the Residential Subdistrict to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide General Plan and the certified LCP.
15. The proposed project is permissible in the proposed Utilities/Services Subdistrict, subject to issuance of a Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit.
16. The proposed fuel storage facility will not adversely impact coastal access and will enhance recreational opportunities on Santa Catalina Island.
17. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 7 of 62**

Declaration for this project. The project is de minimus in its effect on fish and wildlife resources.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles recommends that the Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the recommended change of land use classification from the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict with development restrictions as provided in the related Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4).
2. Certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration, and determine that Local Coastal Plan Amendment Case No. 02-247-(4) will not have a significant impact upon the environment.
3. Find that the recommended Local Coastal Plan Amendment is consistent with the goals, policies and programs of the Los Angeles County General Plan and the Santa Catalina Island Specific Plan.
4. Adopt Local Coastal Plan Amendment No. 02-247-(4), amending the Land Use Map of the Santa Catalina Island Specific Plan and the Land Use policy map of the Santa Catalina Island Land Use Plan (and related text) on the 0.36-acre subject property from "Residential Subdistrict" to "Utilities/Services Subdistrict."

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission in the County of Los Angeles on July 14, 2004.

---

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary  
**County of Los Angeles**  
Regional Planning Commission

**COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT &  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 02-247-(4)  
FINDINGS AND ORDER OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING DATE: May 19, 2004**

**SYNOPSIS:**

The applicant is requesting a Local Coastal Program Amendment to authorize a change in the land use designation of a property located in the Two Harbors Resort Village District of the Santa Catalina Island Local Plan from the Residential Subdistrict to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict on 3,600 square feet (0.08 acres). The applicant is also requesting a Coastal Development Permit and a Conditional Use Permit to authorize removal of the existing 40,000 gallon underground fueling facility located at the Isthmus Cove shoreline and establishment of an above-ground fuel facility approximately 400 feet inland.

**PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COMMISSION:**

May 19, 2004 Public Hearing

A duly noticed public hearing was held on May 19, 2004 before the Regional Planning Commission. Commissioners Valadez, Helsley, Bellamy, Modugno and Rew were present. One person testified, the applicant's representative, Mr. Michael Whitby. Mr. Whitby presented testimony in favor of the request and answered questions presented by the Commission.

The Commission discussed with the applicant the submittal of landscaping plans, the process for bringing fuel to the island and safety features of the proposed fuel tanks.

There being no further testimony, the Regional Planning Commission closed the public hearing, indicated its intent to approve the permit, and directed staff to prepare the final environmental documentation and findings and conditions for approval, including changes to the conditions as discussed and as agreed to by the applicant.

Findings

1. The applicant is requesting a Coastal Development Permit and a Conditional Use Permit to authorize removal of the existing 40,000 gallon underground fueling facility located at the Isthmus Cove shoreline and establishment of an above-ground fuel facility approximately 400 feet inland. The site is located at Two Harbors, Santa Catalina Island, in the Santa Catalina Island Zoned District.



2. Zoning on the site is SP (Specific Plan). The land use designation of the property in the Santa Catalina Island Specific Plan is the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District. Fuel storage tanks are not permitted in the Residential Subdistrict. Concurrent with this approval, however, the Commission is recommending that the Board of Supervisors approve Local Coastal Program Amendment Case No. 02-247-(4). If approved by the Board of Supervisors and certified by the California Coastal Commission, the land use designation of the subject property will be changed from the Residential Subdistrict to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict. Pursuant to Section 22.46.220.B.7, fuel storage tanks are permitted in the Utilities/Services Subdistrict provided a conditional use permit is obtained.
3. Pursuant to Section 22.56.2280, a Coastal Development Permit is required to undertake any development in the Coastal Zone.
4. The proposed above-ground facility consists of two 12,000 gallon fuel tanks within an enclosed steel structure and two fuel dispensers southeast of the proposed building. Fuel lines are also proposed to be installed underground connecting to the existing fuel dispensers at the base of the Isthmus Cove pier. Temporary 8,000 gallon fuel tanks will be installed at the current fueling location at the landside end of the Isthmus Cove pier until the new fuel facility is constructed.
5. Surrounding properties are also zoned SP (Specific Plan) and are located within the Two Harbors Resort Village District of the Specific Plan. The surrounding Two Harbors Subdistricts are as follows:  
  
North: Residential  
South: Residential  
East: Marine Commercial  
West: Residential
6. The subject property is currently used as a service yard for maintenance and storage of heavy equipment. According to the applicant, this use has been in existence for many years subsequent to the certification of the Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program and, therefore, would be considered a legal nonconforming use.
7. Surrounding properties contain the following uses:  
  
North: Residential Uses  
South: Vehicle Storage, Workshop, Boat & Vehicle Parking  
East: Office, Storage Tank, Parking, Boat Yard  
West: Vacant Land, Single Family Residences

8. The proposed use is consistent with the following goal set forth in Section I.B of the LCP:

“Provide the Two Harbors area with residential, commercial, scientific research and public services needs, including land allocation for a broad range of resort recreation opportunities, visitor lodging, housing, commercial and public services to support the needs of permanent residents, visitors, and the USC Marine Science Center.”

The fuel tanks will be in place to service both water and land-based vehicles utilized by residents of and visitors to Two Harbors.

9. The proposed project is consistent with the following policies of the Santa Catalina Island Land Use Plan (LUP):

Coastal Access and Recreation Policy

The proposed project is consistent with Policy #A.1.e.5 which stipulates that new development will not be permitted to interfere with, but rather shall enhance, the public’s right of access to the sea. The current location of the underground tanks and land-based fuel pumps causes congestion due to their proximity to the water and the amount of foot-traffic that occurs in that location. The proposed location would alleviate this congestion by removing the land vehicle fueling pumps from this area and placing them in an area that experiences lower volumes of foot-traffic, thereby enhancing the public’s access to the sea. The facility will be located approximately 400 feet south of the shoreline and adequate public access will be maintained.

Marine and Land Resource Protection Policy

The proposed project is consistent with Policy #5.e.1 which stipulates that new development including buildings, fences, paved areas, signs and landscaping, shall be attractively designed to protect highly scenic natural or historical areas. Views of the shoreline, both from the land and water, should also be protected. The outer appearance of the building, including color and siding materials, has been redesigned to be more compatible with surrounding structures to promote an attractive design pursuant to this policy. The maximum height of the building is 16 feet, 3 inches and will be located at a relatively low point of the area when compared to adjacent structures; therefore, views of the shoreline will not be impacted.

New Development Policy

The proposed project is consistent with Policy #C.4.e.5 which stipulates that plans for development shall be designed to minimize the need for grading operations. The construction of the fuel storage facility will require approximately 215 cubic yards of grading

which will be balanced on site, consistent with this policy.

10. The site plan depicts the location of the proposed 1,296 square foot building that will house the two 28' x 11.5' fuel storage tanks and two dispensers that will be located at the eastern end of the building on a concrete pad and protected by two metal bollards per dispenser. The elevation drawings depict the maximum height of the proposed building at approximately 16 feet, 3 inches.
11. The proposed use complies with the applicable development standards applicable to all developments in the Two Harbors Resort Village District as provided in Section 22.46.230.B of the Los Angeles County Code, as follows:
  - a. The applicant is proposing an earth-tone color that is consistent with the requirement that building colors be light in tone.
  - b. The building is not proposed to include any features that would prevent monotonous unbroken surfaces; however, given that a landscaped buffer is required elsewhere in the Specific Plan, the northern and southern sides of the building will be largely obscured.
  - c. The building is proposed to have a stucco exterior with stone elements, consistent with the permitted Mediterranean style. Stone elements have also been included to enhance the appearance.
  - d. The building will not have a roof, but will have a façade on the eastern side of the building adjacent to the fuel dispensers which will give the appearance of having a pitched roof.
  - e. Stucco and stone surface materials are proposed, consistent with the permitted dominant surface materials.
  - f. The elevation drawings depict the building height at a maximum of 16 feet, 3 inches, in compliance with the 28-foot height limitation.
  - g. The applicant will be required to submit landscaping plans depicting compliance with the landscaping requirements in Section 22.46.230.B.4.b of the Specific Plan.
  - h. The Department of Public Works has reviewed and approved a drainage concept/SUSMP plan for the proposed building and the applicant will be required to comply with this plan.

- i. Any service areas will be screened by the required 20-foot landscaped buffer.
  - j. Due to the topography of the site and the proposed height of the structure, the facility will not obstruct views of the surrounding landscape.
12. The proposed use complies with the applicable development standards applicable to developments in the proposed Utilities/Services Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District as provided in Section 22.46.230.C.11 of the Los Angeles County Code:
- a. The applicant will be required to provide a 20-foot landscaped buffer containing similar vegetation as properties within 1,000 feet, as required.
  - b. The applicant will be required to screen a minimum of 95% of all sides of the building, with the exception of the east side of the building where the fuel dispensers will be located.
13. The proposed project complies with all other applicable development requirements of the Santa Catalina Island Specific Plan as follows:
- a. Pursuant to Section 22.46.460 of the County Code, the applicant prepared a Phase I Archaeological Study for the project which concluded that the proposed project would not adversely impact cultural resources.
  - b. Pursuant to Section 22.46.470 of the County Code, a biological constraints analysis was submitted and reviewed as part of the environmental review of the case. The analysis concluded that the project would not impact sensitive areas surrounding the Two Harbors developed area.
  - c. Pursuant to Section 22.46.480 of the County Code, a geotechnical study was submitted and reviewed as part of the environmental review of the case. The report concludes that the project can be built to avoid geologic hazards provided that the recommendations listed in the report are implemented. A drainage concept/SUSMP was approved by the Department of Public Works on February 3, 2004.
  - d. The proposed project will not involve installation of landscaping on hillside slopes.
  - e. Pursuant to Section 22.46.500 of the County Code, an automatic fire extinguishing system, fire resistive building materials, and smoke detection will be required as conditions of approval.

- f. Pursuant to Section 22.46.510 of the County Code, the project will comply with the county noise control ordinance.
  - g. Pursuant to Section 22.46.520 of the County Code, the proposed building will not detract from existing views of or from Isthmus Cove with respect to size and location and the design is consistent with other buildings in the vicinity.
  - h. In compliance with Section 22.46.530 of the County Code, the site plans depict one painted wood sign, mounted to the building face with a maximum area of 10 square feet.
  - i. The proposed building will be a shelter for the two above-ground fuel tanks and will not be occupied; therefore, sewer, water and solid waste disposal
  - j. will not be required.
14. The proposed facility is consistent with existing land uses to the south and is a natural progression from the Marine Commercial Subdistrict to the Residential Subdistrict.
15. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the environmental guidelines and reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study showed that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning has prepared a Negative Declaration for this project. The Commission finds that the project is *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is exempt from State Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.2 of the California Fish and Game Code.
16. Staff received no public comments in relation to this request.

**BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION CONCLUDES:**

**WITH RESPECT TO THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT:**

- A. The proposed development will be in conformity with the certified local coastal program, upon certification of the requested Local Coastal Program Amendment; and
- B. The proposed development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 of Division 20 of the Public Resources Code;

WITH RESPECT TO THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT:

- C. The proposed use will be consistent with the adopted general plan for the area upon certification of the requested Local Coastal Program Amendment;
- D. The requested use at the proposed location will not adversely affect the health, peace, comfort or welfare of persons residing or working in the surrounding area, will not be materially detrimental to the use, enjoyment or valuation of property of other persons located in the vicinity of the site, and will not jeopardize, endanger or otherwise constitute a menace to the public health, safety or general welfare;
- E. The proposed site is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the development features prescribed in Title 22 of the County Code, or as otherwise required in order to integrate said uses with the uses in the surrounding area;
- F. The proposed site is adequately served by highways or streets of sufficient width and improved as necessary to carry the kind and quantity of traffic such use would generate, and by other public or private service facilities as are required.

AND, THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the hearing substantiates the required findings for a Local Coastal Plan Amendment, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit as set forth in Sections 22.16.170, 22.56.2410, 22.56.090 of the Los Angeles County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

- 1. The Regional Planning Commission has considered the Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, finds on the basis of the whole record before the Regional Planning Commission that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, finds that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Commission, and adopts the Negative Declaration.
- 2. In view of the findings of fact presented above, Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4) is **APPROVED** subject to the attached conditions.

VOTE

5-0

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 15 of 62**

**Concurring: Valadez, Bellamy, Helsley, Rew, Modugno**

**Dissenting: 0**

**Abstaining: 0**

**Absent: 0**

**Action Date: 7/14/04**

1. This grant authorizes the use of the subject property for removal of an existing 40,000 gallon underground fueling facility located at the Isthmus Cove shoreline and establishment of an above-ground fuel facility consisting of two 12,000 gallon fuel tanks within an enclosed structure and two fuel dispensers east of the building on the subject property. This grant also authorizes placement of an underground fuel line to connect the fuel tank facility to the existing fuel dispensers at the base of the Isthmus Cove pier and placement of a temporary 8,000 gallon fuel tank at the current fueling location until the new fuel facility is constructed. This grant is subject to all of the following conditions of approval.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the permittee and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
3. This grant shall not be effective for any purpose until the permittee, and the owner of the subject property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Department of Regional Planning their affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions of the grant have been recorded as required by Condition No. 8, and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Conditions No. 10 and 11.
4. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009. The County shall notify the permittee of any claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall reasonably cooperate in the defense.
5. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall within ten days of the filing pay the Department of Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
  - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.



- b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the permittee according to Los Angeles County Code Section 2.170.010.

- 6. This grant will expire unless used within 2 years from the date of approval. A one-year time extension may be requested, in writing and with payment of the applicable fee, at least six months before the expiration date.
- 7. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
- 8. Prior to the use of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall record the terms and conditions of the grant in the office of the County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the property during the term of this grant, the property owner or permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its conditions to the transferee or lessee of the subject property.
- 9. **This grant will terminate on \_\_ (20 years after its effective date).** Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect. If the Permittee intends to continue operations after such date, a new Conditional Use Permit application shall be filed with the Department of Regional Planning at least six months prior to the expiration of this permit, whether or not any modification of the use is requested at that time.
- 10. The subject property shall be maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions. The permittee shall deposit with the County of Los Angeles the sum of **\$1,500.00**. These monies shall be placed in a performance fund which shall be used exclusively to compensate the Department of Regional Planning for all expenses incurred while inspecting the premises to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval. The fund provides for **10 biennial inspections**. Inspections shall be unannounced.

If additional inspections are required to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant, or if any inspection discloses that the subject property is being used in violation of any condition of this grant, the permittee shall be financially responsible and shall reimburse the Department of Regional Planning for all additional inspections and for any

enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance. Inspections shall be made to ensure compliance with the conditions of this grant as well as adherence to development in accordance with the approved site plan on file. The amount charged for additional inspections shall be \$150.00 per inspection, or the amount equal to the current recovery cost at the time of payment, if that amount is different.

11. Within five (5) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall remit a \$25.00 processing fee payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the Public Resources Code.
12. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Regional Planning Commission or a hearing officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or hearing officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or so as to be a nuisance.
13. Upon approval of this grant, the permittee shall contact the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden to determine what facilities may be necessary to protect the property from fire hazard. Any necessary facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of and within the time periods established by said Department.
14. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
15. All structures shall comply with the requirements of the Division of Building and Safety of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
16. All structures, walls, and fences open to public view shall remain free of extraneous markings, drawings, or signage. These shall include any of the above that do not directly relate to the business being operated on the premises or that do not provide pertinent information about said premises. The only exceptions shall be seasonal decorations or signage provided under the auspices of a civic or non-profit organization.
17. In the event such extraneous markings occur, the permittee shall remove or cover said markings, drawings, or signage within 24 hours of such occurrence, weather permitting. Paint utilized in covering such markings shall be of a color that matches, as closely as possible, the color of the adjacent surfaces.

18. The subject facility shall be developed and maintained in compliance with requirements of Los Angeles County Department of Health Services. Adequate water and sewage disposal facilities shall be provided to the satisfaction of said Department.
19. Within sixty (60) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three (3) copies of a revised Exhibit "A", similar to that presented at the public hearing, that depicts all required project changes, including redesign of the appearance of the building to conform to the requirements of Sections 22.46.230.B.2, 22.46.230.B.4 and 22.46.230.C.11 of the County Code. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved revised Exhibit "A." All revised plot plans must be accompanied by the written authorization of the property owner.
20. Within sixty (60) days of the approval date of this grant, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval three (3) copies of a landscape plan that depicts the size, type and location of all plants, trees and watering systems on the subject property. A minimum 20-foot landscaped area shall be required on the northern, southern and western sides of the building, providing a minimum of 95% coverage of the structure. All plants and trees used for landscaping on the subject property shall be similar to the size, type and density of vegetation located within a 1,000-foot radius from the property. A higher density of vegetation may be permitted in this location if such density is required to comply with screening requirements. The permittee shall maintain all landscaping in a neat, clean and healthy condition, including proper pruning, weeding, fertilizing and replacement of plants when necessary.
21. The height of the building shall not exceed 16 feet, 3 inches above finished grade.
22. The design of the building shall be consistent with Section 22.46.230.B of the Los Angeles County Code. Colors and exterior materials shall be clearly identified on the approved revised Exhibit "A."
23. Signage shall comply with the requirements of Section 22.46.530 of the Los Angeles County Code.
24. An automatic fire extinguishing system meeting the requirements of the County Forester and Fire Warden shall be installed in the facility.
25. Fire resistive building materials shall be utilized in all new construction. Wood shakes and wood shingle roofs are prohibited.

26. Smoke detection shall comply with the Los Angeles County Fire Code and Part 2, Title 24, of the California Code of Regulations.
27. The permittee shall maintain the subject property in a neat and orderly fashion. The permittee shall maintain free of litter all areas of the premises over which the permittee has control.
28. Prior to issuance of building permits, the permittee shall submit all proposed plans concerning the installation of the fuel storage tanks to the Los Angeles Fire Department, Petro Chemical Unit for review and approval.
29. Project related activities likely to have the potential of disturbing suitable bird nesting habitat shall be prohibited from February 1 through August 31, unless a project biologist acceptable to the Director of Planning surveys the project area prior to disturbance to confirm the absence of active nests or nesting habitat. Disturbance shall be defined as any activity that physically removes and/or damages vegetation or habitat or any action that may cause disruption of nesting behavior such as loud noise from equipment and/or artificial night lighting. Surveys shall be conducted weekly, beginning no earlier than 30 days and ending no later than 3 days prior to the commencement of disturbance. If an active nest is discovered, disturbance within 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) shall be postponed until the nest is vacated, offspring have left the nest area and there is no evidence of further attempts at nesting. Limits of avoidance shall be demarcated with flagging or fencing. The project proponent shall record the results of the recommended protective measures described above and submit the records to the Department of Regional Planning to document compliance with applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the protection of native birds.
30. The permittee shall comply with the NPDES requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (DPW).
31. The permittee shall incorporate all appropriate Best Management Practices to enhance quality of urban runoff and stormwater to the satisfaction of the DPW.
32. Prior to any construction/installation, modification, or removal of underground storage tanks and/or industrial waste control or disposal facilities, the permittee shall obtain required approvals and operating permits from the Environmental Programs Division of the DPW.
33. All waste shall be compacted into a container and shipped to a landfill on the mainland.

34. The permittee shall comply with all conditions and requirements of the drainage concept/SUSMP approved by the Department of Public Works on February 3, 2004.
35. If soil contamination is suspected during construction of the project, construction in the area shall stop and remediation shall be conducted to the full satisfaction of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the Hazardous Materials Division of the Fire Department, and the Environmental Programs Division of the DPW.
36. The permittee shall implement waste reduction and recycling programs to divert the solid waste generated, including construction and demolition waste, from landfills.
37. The permittee shall agree to suspend construction in the vicinity of a cultural resource encountered during ground-disturbing activities at the site, and leave the resource in place until a qualified archaeologist can examine them and determine appropriate mitigation measures.
38. The following conditions apply to project construction activities:
  - a. All material graded shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust during the construction phase. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. All clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e. greater than 20 mph averaged over one hour) to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Any materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
  - b. Project construction activities shall be limited to those hours between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Construction work shall not take place on Sundays. Grading, hauling and pile driving shall not commence before 8:00 a.m., Monday through Friday and shall not occur on Saturdays, Sundays or legal holidays.
  - c. During demolition and construction, the permittee and its contractor shall comply with Sections 12.12.010 – 12.12.100 of the Los Angeles County Code regarding building construction noise.
  - d. All fixed and mobile construction equipment shall be in proper operating condition and be fitted with standard silencing devices; engineering noise controls shall be implemented on fixed equipment to minimize adverse effect on nearby properties. Generators and pneumatic compressors shall be noise protected in a manner that will minimize noise inconvenience to adjacent properties. All construction

equipment, fixed or mobile, that is utilized on the site for more than two working days shall be in proper operating condition and fitted with standard factory silencing features. To ensure that mobile and stationary equipment is properly maintained and meets all federal, state, and local standards, the permittee shall maintain an equipment log. Said log shall document the condition of equipment relative to factory specifications and identify the measures taken to ensure that all construction equipment is in proper tune and fitted with an adequate muffling device. Said log shall be submitted to the Director and the Department of Public Works for review and approval on a quarterly basis. In areas where construction equipment (such as generators and air compressors) is left stationary and operating for more than one day within 100-feet of residential land uses, temporary portable noise structures shall be built. These barriers shall be located between the piece of equipment and sensitive land uses.

- e. Parking of construction worker vehicles shall be on-site or at an adjacent off-site location approved by the Director and agreed to by the lessee of said property and restricted to areas buffered from residences located in the vicinity of the subject property, as approved by the Director. If the permittee chooses to provide parking for construction workers off-site, the permittee shall submit to the Director for review and approval plans for temporary construction worker parking and shall demonstrate that the use of the off-site parking spaces shall not interfere with parking spaces required for operation of any use or uses on the property to be used for temporary parking.
  - f. All construction and development on the subject property shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Uniform Building Code and the various related mechanical, electrical, plumbing, fire, grading and excavation codes as currently adopted by the County of Los Angeles.
39. Upon establishment of the permanent fuel tank facility approved by this grant, all temporary tanks established at the Isthmus Cove shoreline shall be removed. No other temporary tanks shall be approved at Two Harbors without obtaining a Coastal Development Permit and any other required permits from any county, state or federal agencies.
40. This grant shall not be used for any purpose until the Board of Supervisors has adopted and the California Coastal Commission has certified a Local Coastal Program Amendment to authorize a change in the land use designation of the property from the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict.

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 23 of 62**

RJF:KJ  
7/14/04

**STAFF USE ONLY**

PROJECT NUMBER: 02-247  
CASES: CUP, CDP  
LCP Amendment



**\* \* \* \* INITIAL STUDY \* \* \* \***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: March 6, 2002 Staff Member: Christina D. Tran  
Thomas Guide: N/A USGS Quad: Santa Catalina North  
Location: Two Harbors, Santa Catalina Island

Description of Project: Application for a CUP and a Coastal Development Permit to allow a new above ground fuel facility with 24/7 automated service. The facility will consist of two 12,000 gallon double contained, ballistic fuel storage tanks which will be contained by a 2 hour fire rated wall and a steel canopy roof structure. Under the canopy will be two fuel dispensers for land based vehicle fueling. In addition, several double contained fuel lines will be installed in an underground trench that will originate from the proposed fuel tanks and terminate at the base of the pier to supply the existing marine fueling dispensers located on the Isthmus Cove pier/floats. The existing 40,000 gallon underground fueling facility located in the View Corridor sub-district at the base of the pier will be removed. Temporary 8,000 gallon fueling tanks will be installed at the existing fuel dispensing location and will be removed once the proposed facility is complete. Application also includes a request for LCP amendment from the existing designation of residential sub-district to utilities/services sub-district. Only two employees will be required to be at the facility during routine cleaning, maintenance, and for the re-fueling of the proposed tanks which will occur on an as needed basis. Approximately 215 c.y. of grading will be required which will be balanced onsite.

Gross Acres: 1225 SF

Environmental Setting: Project site is located within the Two Harbors area and is currently developed with an existing service yard for maintenance and parking of heavy equipment, and material storage sheds. The heavy equipments will be relocated to an adjacent dirt parking area or to Wells Beach which is an existing



---

*industrial area. The storage materials/shed will either be disposed of or relocated to the adjacent dirt parking area or to Wells Beach. Surrounding uses consist of commercial establishments, public and recreational uses, and residences.*

---

Zoning: MXD (Mixed Use Development)

---

General Plan: Rural Communities

---

Community/Area wide Plan: Residential and Marine Commercial (Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Plan)

---

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 26 of 62**

**Major projects in area:**

<b>PROJECT NUMBER</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION &amp; STATUS</b>
<u>CP98131/CD98131</u>	<u>Marine science center master plan (9-13-00 approved)</u>
<u>CP01015</u>	<u>Continue operation of existing heliport (pending)</u>
<u>CD01016</u>	<u>Replacement of existing 13 mobile home units (pending)</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

**Responsible Agencies**

- ☐ None  
☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board  
     ☒ Los Angeles Region  
     ☐ Lahontan Region  
☒ Coastal Commission  
☐ Army Corps of Engineers

☐
☐
☐
☐

**Trustee Agencies**

- ☒ None

- ☐ State Fish and Game

**Special Reviewing Agencies**

- ☐ None  
☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy  
☐ National Parks  
☐ National Forest  
☐ Edwards Air Force Base  
☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area

- ☒ DTSC

- ☒ Catalina Island Conservancy

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

**Regional Significance**

- ☒ None  
☐ SCAG Criteria  
☐ Air Quality  
☐ Water Resources  
☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

**County Reviewing Agencies**

- ☐ Subdivision Committee

- ☒ DPW: Environmental Programs; Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division; Watershed Management;

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>	<i>Watershed Management (NPDES Section); Drainage &amp; Grading</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> State Parks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Department
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>

<b>IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX</b>		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			<u>Less than Significant Impact/No Impact</u>			
			<u>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</u>			
				<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>		
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				<u>Potential Concern</u>
<u>HAZARDS</u>	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

## DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS\* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

### Development Policy Map

- Designation: Rural Communities
- ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 29 of 62**

3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

**If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.**

- ☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

**Environmental Finding:**

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the  
environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will  
reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT\*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that  
the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above

as “significant”.

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

- ☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

\*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

**HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Sections 308B, 309, 310, and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

*Soils and geology report required; DPW concluded that proposed project will not have significant impacts*

*in their letter of October 7, 2003*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
Impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

**HAZARDS - 2. Flood**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A    ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)



☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size    ☐ Project Design

*Drainage concept/SUSMP approved by DPW on 2/3/04.*

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

## HAZARDS - 3. Fire

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?
				<i>Very high fire hazard zone</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8  
☒ Fuel Modification / Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
significant/No impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than

### HAZARDS - 4. Noise

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?

- c.

☐

☒

☐

Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
- d.

☐

☒

☐

Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
- e.

☐

☐

☐

Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No impact

**RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations <i>or</i> is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? <i>Fuel dispensing is subject to NPDES requirements</i>
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? <i>Fuel dispensing is subject to NPDES requirements</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Waste Permit           | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)   |

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

- ☐ Lot Size    ☐ Project Design    ☐ Compatible Use

☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES**

☐

**OTHER**

**CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by, **air quality**?

Potentially significant  
impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

**RESOURCES - 3. Biota**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g. coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian, woodland, wetland, etc.)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**  
☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ ERB/SEATAC Review ☐ Oak Tree Permit

*Applicant shall remove all non-native vegetation from the project site.*

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, **biotic** resources?

☐ Potentially significant impact ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

**RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

<input type="checkbox"/> MITIGATION MEASURES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Design
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase 1 Archaeology Report

Stop work condition

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially significant impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than significant with project mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than significant/No
---	--	--



RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

---

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant  
impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?
				<u>Existing tank is within view corridor</u>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
				<u>Above ground 24,000 gallon fuel storage tank</u>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

<input type="checkbox"/> MITIGATION MEASURES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/> Lot Size	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Design
	<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Report
	<input type="checkbox"/> Compatible Use


## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

### SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Fuel service facility over 520 s.f.</i> Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Traffic Report

☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

No traffic problem in the area

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130
- ☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

- ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES
- ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- ☐ Potentially significant impact
- ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?



c.

☐

☒

☐

Could the project create student transportation problems?

d.

☐

☒

☐

Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?

e.

☐

☐

☐

Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication

☐ Government Code Section 65995

☐ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 51 of 62**

☐ Potentially significant impact      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☒ Less than significant/No impact

**SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services**

**SETTING/IMPACTS**

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

**STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS**

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269      ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES  
CONSIDERATIONS**



**OTHER**

Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)

Page 52 of 62

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design

*All waste is compacted into a container and shipped to a landfill on the mainland*

---

**CONCLUSION**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities** services?

☐ Potentially significant impact      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use


## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No

### OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? <i>Gas and diesel</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site? <i>Underground fuel tank</i>
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
h.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
i.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

---

---

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER

CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

*Applicant shall comply with all state and county code requirements*

---

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
				<i>LCP plan amendment required</i>
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hillside Management Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☒ OTHER

CONSIDERATIONS

*Approval of LCP plan amendment would make the proposed project consistent with plan designation*

CONCLUSION



**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 57 of 62**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant  
impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other factors?

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant impact

☐ Less than significant with project mitigation

☒ Less than significant/No

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Does the project have possible environmental effects that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.
c.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

- ☐ Potentially significant impact
- ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation
- ☒ Less than significant/No impact

**Honorable Board of Supervisors**  
**Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/**  
**Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 61 of 62**



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning  
 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012  
 Telephone (213) 974-6443

**PROJECT No.** 02-247-(4)  
LCP Amendment  
Coastal Development Permit  
Conditional Use Permit

<b>CONSENT MEETING DATE</b> 7/14/04	<b>CONTINUE TO</b>
<b>AGENDA ITEM</b> 8	
<b>PUBLIC HEARING DATE</b> May 19, 2004	

<b>APPLICANT</b> Santa Catalina Island Company		<b>OWNER</b> Santa Catalina Island Company		<b>REPRESENTATIVE</b> Santa Catalina Island Company	
<b>REQUEST</b> Local Coastal Program Amendment to change the land use designation of the subject property from the Residential Subdistrict of the Two Harbors Resort Village District to the Utilities/Services Subdistrict on 3,600 square feet (0.08 acres).  Coastal Development Permit & Conditional Use Permit to authorize removal of the existing 40,000 gallon underground fueling facility located at the Isthmus Cove shoreline and establishment of an above-ground fuel facility approximately 400 feet inland and consisting of two 12,000 gallon fuel tanks within an enclosed steel structure and two fuel dispensers southeast of the proposed building. Fuel lines are also proposed to be installed underground connecting to the existing fuel dispensers at the base of the Isthmus Cove pier. Temporary 8,000 gallon fuel tanks will be installed at the current fueling location until the new fuel facility is constructed.					
<b>LOCATION/ADDRESS</b> Two Harbors (Lot 88), Santa Catalina Island, 400' west of Isthmus Cove  <b>ACCESS</b> Via existing unnamed dirt roadways			<b>ZONED DISTRICT</b> Santa Catalina Island		
			<b>COMMUNITY</b> Two Harbors		
			<b>EXISTING ZONING</b> SP (Specific Plan)		
<b>SIZE</b> 1,296 Square Foot Building (property boundaries encompass entire Two Harbors district)	<b>EXISTING LAND USE</b> Service yard for maintenance and storage of heavy equipment		<b>SHAPE</b> Square building (property boundaries encompass entire Two Harbors district)	<b>TOPOGRAPHY</b> Slightly sloping	
<b>SURROUNDING LAND USES &amp; LAND USE DESIGNATIONS</b> North: Residential Uses/Residential Subdistrict			East: Office, Storage Tank, Parking, Boat Yard/Marine Commercial Subdistrict		

**Honorable Board of Supervisors  
Local Coastal Plan Amendment/Coastal Development Permit/  
Conditional Use Permit Case No. 02-247-(4)**

**Page 62 of 62**

South: Vehicle Storage, Workshop, Boat & Vehicle Parking/ Residential Subdistrict	West: Vacant Land, Single Family Residences/Residential Subdistrict
--	--

GENERAL PLAN	DESIGNATION	MAXIMUM DENSITY	CONSISTENCY
Countywide	_____	_____	_____
Area/Community Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program	Residential Subdistrict of Two Harbors Resort Village District (Proposing change to Utilities/Services Subdistrict)	N/A	See Staff Report

**ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS**  
Negative Declaration

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN**  
The site plan depicts the location of the proposed 1,296 square foot building that will house the two 28' x 11.5' fuel storage tanks, two dispensers that will be located at the southeastern end of the building on a concrete pad and protected by two metal bollards per dispenser. A metal canopy is depicted extending 18 feet beyond the building to the southeast and 8 feet to the north and south. The elevation drawings depict the maximum height of the proposed building at 18 feet and depict the area of the canopy southeast of the building being supported by two 15 foot high steel columns.

**KEY ISSUES**

- Compatibility with Santa Catalina Island Local Coastal Program
- Satisfaction of Plan Amendment Burden of Proof requirements
- Satisfaction of Section 22.56.2320 of the Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Coastal Development Permit Burden of Proof requirements.
- Satisfaction of Section 22.56.040 of the Los Angeles County Code Title 22, Conditional Use Permit Burden of Proof requirements

(If more space is required, use opposite side)

**TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

STAFF CONTACT PERSON Mr. Kevin Johnson		
RPC HEARING DATE(S) May 19, 2004	RPC ACTION DATE July 14, 2004	RPC RECOMMENDATION Approval
MEMBERS VOTING AYE Valadez, Bellamy, Helsley, Rew, Modugno	MEMBERS VOTING NO 0	MEMBERS ABSTAINING 0
STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING) Approval		
SPEAKERS*  (O)      0                      (F)      1	PETITIONS  (O)      0                      (F)      0	LETTERS  (O)      0                      (F)      0

\*(O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor